

# American Archival Literature: Expanding Horizons and Continuing Needs, 1901–1987

RICHARD J. COX

**Abstract:** The literature of a profession—or the quality of its theory, research on that theory, and the dissemination of that research—is one indication of a profession's health and vitality. Fortunately, American archival literature has shown steady and considerable improvement over the years, but archivists still must grapple with some serious problems challenging their literature; more importantly, the archival profession's future partly depends on the resolution of problems such as those that affect its literature. This essay reviews the history of archival writing in the United States, analyzes the development of this literature, evaluates obstacles to archival research and publication, and recommends actions for the improvement of the literature.

*About the author:* Richard J. Cox is Associate Archivist, External Programs, New York State Archives. He previously worked at the Alabama Department of Archives and History, City of Baltimore, and the Maryland Historical Society. He received an M.A. in history from the University of Maryland.

*This is a revised version of a paper delivered at the fiftieth annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, Chicago, 28 August 1986.*

DURING THE PAST FEW YEARS there has been an increasing interest in understanding the origins and present condition of the American archival community; one sign of this is the intensive profession-wide planning that has come to be accepted as crucial for meeting the archival mission. The essay that follows is intended to be a contribution to such understanding and planning. American archival literature, one significant measure of the health of the archival profession, has shown steady and considerable improvement over the years, especially since the early 1970s. Although archivists should be pleased with the progress of their literature in the United States, they must also recognize the serious challenges they face in continuing to strengthen their literature and profession.

In examining archival literature, this article considers anything written and published about the archival profession, its mission, and its technical procedures. Descriptive writings, reports, case studies, historical accounts, and theoretical treatises have all been reviewed. All of these publications are essential to the formation and nurturing of the knowledge and theory that gives the archival profession its distinctiveness and supports its practical work. The quality of archival knowledge is mainly attributable to the literature that defines, debates, and refines the profession's practices and the reasons for these practices. Even litera-

ture that is purely descriptive or historical can contribute to the development of a profession's theoretical knowledge.<sup>1</sup>

This essay reviews the history of archival writing in the United States, analyzes the development of this literature, evaluates obstacles to its continued development, and recommends actions for its improvement. The discussion is limited to archival literature in the United States because archival writing viewed on an international scale is too complex for easy characterization, given the varying archival traditions of American, European, and third world nations. Nevertheless, the implications of this study for archival literature worldwide are many, since over the past one-half century the writings of American archivists have had a progressively wider influence on the international archival scene.<sup>2</sup>

There have been at least three distinctive phases in the evolution of archival literature in the United States, each marked by particular characteristics and recognizable dividing points. The first period of archival literature commenced at the turn of the twentieth century with the establishment of the first state archives, and ended in 1936 with the organization of the Society of American Archivists (SAA). This was a time of gestation. Significant writings on archival topics were rare. Many publications were composed with an eye to the future formation of archival institutions or to provide practical

<sup>1</sup>On the importance of theory in the archival profession, see Richard J. Cox, "Professionalism and Archivists in the United States," *American Archivist* 49 (Summer 1986): 229-47.

<sup>2</sup>The differences in the international archival community have been most clearly shown in the writings on archival education. American archivists have emphasized modern records with a bias for practical, on-the-job training, while European archivists traditionally have been trained more intensively in historical methodology oriented to earlier records. In contrast to both, third world countries have required more basic assistance and often blended the American and European traditions. See Michael Cook, "Professional Training of Archivists: Problems of Modernization and Harmonization," *UNESCO Journal of Information Science, Librarianship and Archives Administration* 2 (July-September 1980): 150-58; Ruth W. Helmuth, "Education for American Archivists: A View from the Trenches," *American Archivist* 44 (Fall 1981): 295-303; William J. Orr, "Archival Training in Europe," *American Archivist* 44 (Winter 1981): 27-39; Wilfred I. Smith, "The ICA and Technical Assistance to Developing Countries," *American Archivist* 39 (July 1976): 343-51; and Anne Thurston, "The Training of Archivists from Developing Countries: A Commonwealth Perspective," *Archivaria* 20 (Summer 1985): 116-26.

guidelines directing the basic functions of these repositories.

Next came the formative era in the development of an American archival literature. During this period, American archival writing slowly formed into a significant corpus, although it remained uneven at best. This era ended in 1972 with the publication of the report of the SAA Committee for the 1970s, which called for the SAA to sponsor, besides the publication of a quarterly journal, the production of basic professional literature.

The final phase of archival writing has extended from 1972 to the present. In this very short time span American archival literature has matured. In the early 1970s archival educators taught introductory archives administration courses armed with a few basic texts, most likely the products of T. R. Schellenberg or heavily influenced by him; in the mid 1980s they now must choose from numerous manuals, essays scattered in a variety of archival, library science, and historical journals, and an assortment of monographs.

Archivists are now beginning a fourth period of archival writing, part of what one archivist recently has called the "Age of Archival Analysis."<sup>3</sup> This *new* writing is more concerned with professional standards, recognizes the value of evaluating and assessing the archival profession, is committed to collective action to preserve America's documentary heritage, and accepts the need to communicate to the public the importance of historical records. The long-term impact on and benefits for the archival profession of this new literature can only be conjectured at

this point, but it promises to strengthen the profession and to transform what archivists write about and how they write.

### **The Beginning of Archival Writing, 1901-1936**

The long, thirty-five year gestation of an archival literature was the natural result of the archivist's quest for a separate identity. Operating under the aegis of professional historical associations, archivists had no distinctive educational requirements. Their hopes for composing a body of archival theory were lost amid the pressures of establishing archival repositories, especially the long drive for a national archives. More importantly, perhaps, archivists did not possess adequate outlets for publishing their work, except the limited space *historical* journals provided for essays on archival subjects. It would have been remarkable indeed if an important corpus of archival literature had appeared during these years.<sup>4</sup>

Between 1901 and the mid 1930s archival writings were few, scattered widely in various journals and institutional publications, and were generally descriptive rather than theoretical or prescriptive in tone and content. The few manuals of sorts that were published during these years were quickly outdated and remain of interest now only as historical curiosities.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, a few notable essays and volumes appeared that had a lasting influence on archival practice. Waldo G. Leland probably made the strongest contributions during these years. Leland served as a conduit for European ideas about archival administration, urged—

<sup>3</sup>Bruce W. Dearstyne, "'Archivists and Public History: Issues, Problems, and Prospects': An Introduction," *Public Historian* 8 (Summer 1986): 2.

<sup>4</sup>The best characterization of this period remains William F. Birdsall, "The Two Sides of the Desk: The Archivist and the Historian, 1909-1935," *American Archivist* 38 (April 1975): 159-72.

<sup>5</sup>For example, John C. Fitzpatrick, *Notes on the Care, Cataloguing, Calendaring and Arranging of Manuscripts* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913, 1921, and 1928) and Cassius C. Stiles, *Public Archives: A Manual for Their Administration in Iowa* (Des Moines, 1928). For a discussion of the work during this period, see Richard C. Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983), chapter 2.

although unsuccessfully—the drafting of a manual on archival principles, and co-authored several model finding aids.<sup>6</sup> Although Margaret C. Norton began writing her most important essays in the later part of this period, her efforts would have a greater impact many years later as archivists rediscovered her writings.<sup>7</sup> More typical of the archival literature of these years was the 1932 Public Archives Commission publication on local government records, which was written to encourage historians to use local records and did not explain the administration of these materials.<sup>8</sup>

It is easiest to summarize the archival literature of the first three decades of the twentieth century by examining two evaluations of the archival community, one written at the beginning and the other at the close of this period. In 1909 Leland addressed the subject of “American archival problems,” discussing, among other things, the need to establish a foundation for an “archive economy, sound in principle, and in practice adapted to American conditions, in conformity to which all our public archives, federal, state, county, municipal, and town, and perhaps even our private archives, shall in time come to be administered.” Leland envisioned an archival literature contributing to this construct.<sup>9</sup> In 1935 Theodore C. Blegen returned to Leland’s concerns, lamenting the lack of archival literature and calling for further investigation into archival systems and production of a glossary.<sup>10</sup> Thus, little progress had been

made during the years between Leland’s and Blegen’s essays. Archivists still had no distinct identity; despite Leland’s work, the European literature was inaccessible to most American archivists, and American archival repositories remained in the shadow of the antiquarian tradition of the historical societies—collecting haphazardly with only modest concern for control or the intellectual integrity of records and record-keeping systems.

### The Formation of an Archival Literature, 1936–1972

Two events, the founding of the National Archives in 1934 and the organization of SAA two years later, led American archivists into a new phase of thinking and writing about their work. From the mid 1930s into the early 1970s, when the SAA Committee for the 1970s set an aggressive new agenda for an American archival literature, archivists slowly emerged as a distinctive community, creating in the process a larger and more varied collection of writings.<sup>11</sup>

The story of archival writing in these years is essentially the story of the National Archives and the SAA. The National Archives became the largest archival employer in the country and dominated, with mixed results, the society. Both the institution and the association provided a national focus and outlets for the publication of archival practices and theory. The *American Archivist*, established in 1938, was, and remains, the premier archival journal in the United States. The

<sup>6</sup>For a description of Leland’s career see Rodney A. Ross, “Waldo Gifford Leland: Archivist by Association,” *American Archivist* 46 (Summer 1983): 264–76.

<sup>7</sup>Her most famous essay, “The Archives Department as an Administrative Unit in Government,” was published at the end of this period in 1930. See Thornton C. Mitchell, ed., *Norton on Archives: The Writings of Margaret Cross Norton on Archives & Records Management* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975), 3–12.

<sup>8</sup>*The Preservation of Local Archives* (Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, Public Archives Commission, 1932).

<sup>9</sup>American Historical Association, *Annual Report, 1909*, vol. I, 302–08.

<sup>10</sup>*Problems of American Archivists*, National Archives Bulletin no. 2, November 1936.

<sup>11</sup>For some understanding of this period, see J. Frank Cook, “The Blessings of Providence on an Association of Archivists,” *American Archivist* 46 (Fall 1983): 374–99.



journal revolutionized archival writing and the archival profession, providing a forum for the archival writings that, prior to 1938, had had little chance for publication, as well as giving considerable space for reviews and news. The *American Archivist* was the chief professional bond for archivists, the "voice of the profession."<sup>12</sup>

In addition to providing crucial support for SAA's quarterly journal, the National Archives was also fertile ground for other archival writings. Cognizant of creating a new institution and profession, many staff members of the National Archives endeavored to establish both through writing. The National Archives' annual reports, *Bulletins*, and *Staff Information Papers*—along with the *American Archivist*—"made available to archivists the first substantial American contributions to the preservation and administration of archives."<sup>13</sup> Many of the profession's chief principles and practices were born or refined in the heady atmosphere of the young National Archives, led by such archival pioneers as T. R. Schellenberg, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Philip C. Brooks. Schellenberg's staff writings alone, later brought together in his two extremely influential manuals, did much

to mold the nature of the archival world.<sup>14</sup>

There were, of course, other important influences on American archival literature. One significant contribution was the Historical Records Survey (HRS) conducted from 1936 to 1942. In recent years much attention has focused on the voluminous finding aids produced by this massive federal effort, and their subsequent abysmal neglect. But the HRS also appears to have left behind literature about archival methodology that was absorbed into archival practice.<sup>15</sup> Between 1934 and the early 1970s, some of the first truly American archival manuals were published, as well as a small group of monographs and collections of essays that revealed a growing sense of archival identity and vigor. The history of the profession was one concern, as modern archivists sought to understand the origins of their work; these efforts produced a few outstanding writings.<sup>16</sup> Such historical writings and other *festschriften* and essay collections were indicators that the maturing archival community was gaining some sense of retrospection.<sup>17</sup> Schellenberg's manuals, already mentioned, added to the profession's developing maturity.

The most interesting aspect of this second period was the spate of writings in

<sup>12</sup>Karl Trever, "The American Archivist: The Voice of a Profession," *American Archivist* 15 (April 1952): 147-55.

<sup>13</sup>H. G. Jones, *The Records of a Nation: Their Management, Preservation, and Use* (New York: Atheneum, 1969), 20.

<sup>14</sup>Schellenberg, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956) and *The Management of Archives* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965). For a recounting of Schellenberg's career, see Jane F. Smith, "Theodore R. Schellenberg: Americanizer and Popularizer," *American Archivist* 44 (Fall 1981): 313-26.

<sup>15</sup>This aspect of the importance of the HRS on the developing archival profession needs more study. For some of these writings, see Frank B. Evans, comp., *Modern Archives and Manuscripts: A Select Bibliography* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1975), 136.

<sup>16</sup>Leslie W. Dunlap, *American Historical Societies, 1790-1860* (Madison, Wisc.: privately printed, 1944); Roscoe R. Hill, *American Missions in European Archives* (Mexico: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, 1951); H. G. Jones, *For History's Sake: The Preservation and Publication of North Carolina History, 1663-1903* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965); and Ernst Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972).

<sup>17</sup>William B. Hesseltine and Donald R. McNeil, eds., *In Support of Clío: Essays and Memory of Herbert A. Kellar* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1958); Ruth Anna Fisher and William Lloyd Fox, ed., *J. Franklin Jameson: A Tribute* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1965); and Ken Munden, ed., *Archives & the Public Interest: Selected Essays by Ernst Posner* (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1967).

the 1960s that endeavored to define specific aspects of the condition of the American archival profession and to recommend changes for improvement. The volumes of Walter Muir Whitehill on historical societies, of Ernst Posner on state archives, and of H. G. Jones on the National Archives remain classic statements and analyses of their respective topics. Walter Rundell's study on American historical research could be added to this group because of its sensitivity to the work of archivists in supporting research into the United States' past.<sup>18</sup> These works share several common characteristics: a broad approach to their topic, the support of national professional associations and foundations, and an optimism that improvement would result from their work, its distribution, and reading. They are, perhaps, typical products of the 1960s, a time of abundant research funds, increasing societal change, and agitation for wide reform and improvement.

Although this period produced some memorable and important archival literature, it is questionable if it, in fact, laid a solid foundation for the American archival profession. In actuality, the prepon-

derance of writing by the archival community were finding aids and reports of institutional activities, which largely avoided the more difficult, theoretical issues<sup>19</sup> (see Appendixes I and II). Although archival practice showed a gradual movement toward common practices, these practices did not constitute standards or theory. Most revealing was that action on the recommendations of the reports by Whitehill, Posner, and Jones was slow in coming, when it came at all. Posner's book was accepted immediately as a reference book instead of a call to action.<sup>20</sup> Whitehill's study, judging by more recent evaluations of American historical societies, had little impact.<sup>21</sup> In addition, the archival profession suffered during these years its only major schism, the split between archivists and records managers. This separation not only slowed the development of a strong archival theory for such functions as appraisal, but it severely hurt the work of the modern records manager. The literature of both occupations was weakened as a result.<sup>22</sup>

The condition of American archival literature from the mid 1930s to early 1970s is perhaps best summed up by the only

<sup>18</sup>Walter Muir Whitehill, *Independent Historical Societies: An Enquiry Into Their Research and Publication Functions and Their Financial Future* (Boston: Boston Athenaeum, 1962); Ernst Posner, *American State Archives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964); Jones, *Records of a Nation*; and Walter Rundell, Jr., *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970).

<sup>19</sup>This can be seen in two ways. First, all through these years and up to the present, the quantity of publications on more theoretical issues like appraisal and professional education have been far below the number of writings on topics such as arrangement, description, and repository studies (see Appendixes I and II). Second, there were a number of articles during this second period that highlighted the importance of institutional reports: C. C. Crittendon, "Publications Policies for Archival and Historical Agencies," *American Archivist* 3 (October 1940): 245-50; Leon De Valinger, Jr., "Preparation of Annual Reports," *American Archivist* 16 (April 1953): 161-63; Morris L. Radoff, "Reports of State Archivists," *American Archivist* 17 (October 1954): 331-39; Crittendon, "Reports of State Archivists," *American Archivist* 18 (October 1955): 309-15; and Howard H. Eddy, "Reports of State Archivists," *American Archivist* 20 (January 1957): 13-18.

<sup>20</sup>H. G. Jones, "The Pink Elephant Revisited," *American Archivist* 43 (Fall 1980): 473-83.

<sup>21</sup>Charles Phillips and Patricia Hogan, *A Culture At Risk: Who Cares for America's Heritage? and The Wages of History: The AASLH Employment Trends and Salary Survey* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1984).

<sup>22</sup>This topic requires much more analysis. The schism is evident in numerous essays on this subject in the *American Archivist* during the 1950s and 1960s. The damage to the work of records managers can be seen in the general weakness of their literature on historical records issues. Many archivists remain uncomfortable with records management despite its potential for identifying and selecting records of enduring value. Despite closely related missions, archivists and records managers remain largely divided into two camps, characterizing each other as records destroyers or antiquarian packrats.

self-reflective analysis on archival writing produced during these years. In his 1957 SAA presidential address, Lester J. Cappon emphasized the need for archivists to contribute to historical scholarship, primarily by producing finding aids and other tools that encouraged the use of archival holdings. Many today might argue that Cappon's tie of archivists to historians was far too limiting, considering the recent strengthening of connections between archivists and librarians and other information professionals; however, Cappon was chastizing his colleagues for being little more than "tardy scholars," producing few finding aids and writing little in general. Archival scholarship and hence its literature still had significant areas for improvement.<sup>23</sup>

### The Maturation of Archival Literature, 1972-1986

SAA's Committee for the 1970s recognized the deficiencies of archival scholarship. The committee's report, published in 1972, provides the clearest delineation of stages in the historical development of an American archival literature. The report offered several recommendations concerning archival literature, including:

- strengthening the *American Archivist*, especially expanding it in "scope and content";
- publishing an SAA newsletter six times a year;
- publishing a "pamphlet series" on "practical archival and technical

problems" for the beginning archivist;

- publishing, on an occasional basis, "manuals, technical pamphlets, and other archival studies to meet the varied needs of our membership, and carefully edited readings which would be of particular value to students of archives administration and allied subjects";
- publishing directories and publicity brochures;
- hiring a fulltime SAA editor.<sup>24</sup>

This remarkable document precisely laid out SAA's publications program of the past decade.

The publication efforts by the SAA have been the major achievement in the history of an American archival literature during the 1970s and early 1980s. In 1951 it was said that the *American Archivist* "remains . . . the Society's major venture in the field of professional publication."<sup>25</sup> A quarter of a century later, the journal was but one part of its publication program. Armed with grants from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the society started and has sustained a series of publications intended to be the basic building blocks of professional theory and practice.<sup>26</sup> This "Basic Manual Series" has been supplemented with other publications on such diverse topics as Native American archives, business archives, and basic education workshop guidelines.<sup>27</sup> SAA's publications program has helped the archival profes-

<sup>23</sup>"Tardy Scholars Among the Archivists," *American Archivist* 21 (January 1958): 3-16.

<sup>24</sup>Phillip P. Mason, "The Society of American Archivists in the Seventies: Report of the Committee for the 1970's," *American Archivist* 35 (April 1972): 193-217.

<sup>25</sup>Trever, "The American Archivist," 147.

<sup>26</sup>The Archives and Manuscripts series includes the following: Maynard Brichford, *Appraisal and Accessioning* (1977); David B. Gracy, II, *Arrangement and Description* (1977); Sue E. Holbert, *Reference and Access* (1977); Timothy Walch, *Security* (1977); John A. Fleckner, *Surveys* (1977); Gail Farr Casterline, *Exhibits* (1980); H. Thomas Hickerson, *An Introduction to Automated Access* (1981); Ralph Ehrenberg, *Maps and Architectural Drawings* (1982); Ann Pederson and Gail Casterline, *Public Programs* (1982); Carolyn Hoover Sung, *Reprography* (1982); Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, *Conservation* (1984); Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, Gerald J. Munoff, and Margery S. Long, *Administration of Photographic Collections* (1984); Margaret L. Hedstrom, *Machine-Readable Records* (1984); and Gary M. and Trudy Huskamp Peterson, *Law* (1985).

<sup>27</sup>A few examples include Edie Hedlin, *Business Archives: An Introduction* (1978); Thomas C. Pardo, *Basic Archival Workshops* (1982); William Deiss, *Museum Archives: An Introduction* (1984); and John A. Fleckner, *Native American Archives: An Introduction* (1984).

sion to begin to better define its basic work, provided many of the basic references needed for archival education, and has given SAA and archivists a higher profile among related professions and some of their constituencies.<sup>28</sup>

During these years the SAA was joined by other organizations that established archival or closely related subject journals, providing a much broader base for archival publications. *Prologue*, *Mid-western Archivist*, *Provenance* (formerly *Georgia Archive*), *Archivaria*, and the *Public Historian* are, or should be, essential reading for any archivist. Several non-archival journals have become more open to essays on archival topics. Although library science and history journals have always included a few archival essays (see Appendixes III and IV), higher quality essays treating important archival issues now seem to be appearing in these publications. Some of the increased interest of these journals is due to the federal government's eroding financial support for archival, historical, and library programs alike, uniting these professions in the face of a common enemy.<sup>29</sup> Also, the shift by regional archival organizations from a complete preoccupation with basic, practical concerns to the consideration of professional issues like archival image, certification, and educational standards has caused the production of more papers

than can be published by the journals featuring only essays on archival subjects. Finally, more—although not enough—archivists appear to be writing than before. This is primarily a result of the growth of the profession and archivists' recognition of the importance of research and its dissemination. It is, therefore, no surprise or coincidence that the summer 1986 issues of the *Public Historian* and *Journal of Library Administration* were special volumes on archives.<sup>30</sup> The simultaneous publication of two such journal issues is unprecedented in the history of American archival literature.

There has also been a rapid and dramatic increase in the number of monographs on archival subjects, published on a wide variety of subjects by an equally diverse group of publishers. There have been significant contributions on the formulation of standard practices, renewed interest in theory, volumes on automation, explorations in interprofessional cooperation, further examination of local public records, and some excellent writings on the origins and development of certain aspects of the archival profession. These publications have been issued by the presses of historical associations, universities, library-information science publishers, and occasionally commercial publishers.<sup>31</sup> In addition, the National Archives has revitalized its publishing

<sup>28</sup>For some evaluation of this publication program, see Philip P. Mason, "Archives in the Seventies: Promises and Fulfillment," *American Archivist* 44 (Summer 1981): 204; and Terry Abraham, "Publishing for the Archival Profession," *Scholarly Publishing* 15 (April 1984): 266–67. For a recent evaluation of the archival profession over the last decade, see Larry J. Hackman, "A Perspective on American Archives," *Public Historian* 8 (Summer 1986): 5–23.

<sup>29</sup>Almost every issue of the newsletters of the American Historical Association and Organization of American Historians includes substantial information about archival issues.

<sup>30</sup>The *Public Historian* issue, edited by Bruce W. Dearstyne, explored the place of archival administration in public history. The *Journal of Library Administration* issue, edited by Lawrence J. McCrank, contains essays on various aspects of the relationship between archives and libraries. I would like to reemphasize that the total portion of archivists writing for publication is still too small for the good of the profession.

<sup>31</sup>Some of these publications include Kenneth W. Duckett, *Modern Manuscripts: A Practical Manual for Their Management, Care, and Use* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1975); Robert L. Clark, Jr., ed., *Archive-Library Relations* (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1976); Edmund Berkeley, Jr., *Autographs and Manuscripts: A Collector's Manual* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978); H. G. Jones, *Local Government Records: An Introduction to Their Management, Preservation and Use* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1980); Burl Noggle, *Working With History: The Historical Records Survey in Louisiana and the Nation, 1936–1942* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981); Victor Gondos, Jr., *J. Franklin Jameson and the Birth of the National Archives, 1906–1926* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981); Nancy Peace, ed., *Archival Choices: Managing the*

program,<sup>32</sup> and archivists are more committed than ever to wrestling with the significant issues and problems confronting the profession and its mission. Largely deriving from the efforts of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, SAA, and the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators (NAGARA), writings have appeared that instill in archivists the sense of a new and fuller agenda.<sup>33</sup> This new interest has also suggested that archivists may have largely completed the task of "basic" writings (although the profession could benefit from the preparation of a comprehensive basic primer on archival administration) and need to continue moving towards the resolution of the tougher problems and theoretical issues presented by operating in and trying to document late twentieth century society.

### Present Challenges

Although the archivist now can lay claim to essential writings comprising more than a single bookcase shelf, there are numerous significant problems to be addressed in the continued development of an American archival literature. At least seven challenges remain. These include (1) the continuing lack of adequate archival theory, (2) the need for more opportunities for research and writing,

(3) the need for more energetic national leadership in the support and dissemination of archival literature, (4) archivists' lingering doubts about their identity, (5) limitations of archival education, (6) the need to find suitable outlets for scholarly publication, and (7) archivists' inability to write for broader audiences. All of these issues require serious attention in order to protect the health of the American archival profession and to ensure its continued growth.

Concern about archival theory has been the subject of recent debate. In an important essay published in 1981, Frank Burke lamented that archival theory was not flourishing in the United States because such "theory can only grow in the cool and contemplative conditions of the cloister, i.e., in the classroom and its concomitant academic setting."<sup>34</sup> In this essay, which has generated more response than most archival writing, Burke presented to his colleagues a series of theoretical questions and topics deserving exploration. Some have felt that Burke was splitting hairs between practice and theory, and others have tried to build on his ideas.<sup>35</sup> Burke is correct, however; without any commitment to the development of theory, the archival community lacks one of the essential features of a profession, and weakens its incentive for improving practice and meeting its mission

---

*Historical Record in An Age of Abundance* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1984); and Richard M. Kesner, *Automation for Archivists and Records Managers: Planning and Implementation Strategies* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1984).

<sup>32</sup>See, as examples, Maygene F. Daniels and Timothy Walch, eds., *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings on Archival Theory and Practice* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Service, 1984) and Patricia A. Andrews and Bettye J. Grier, comps., *Writings on Archives, Historical Manuscripts, and Current Records: 1979-1982* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1985).

<sup>33</sup>Lisa B. Weber, ed., *Documenting America: Assessing the Condition of Historical Records in the States* ([Albany]: National Association of State Archives and Records Administrators in cooperation with the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, [1983]); Committee on the Records of Government, *Report* (Washington, D.C.: March 1985); and *Planning for the Archival Profession: A Report of the SAA Task Force on Goals and Priorities* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1986).

<sup>34</sup>"The Future Course of Archival Theory in the United States," *American Archivist* 44 (Winter 1981): 42.

<sup>35</sup>Lester J. Cappon, "What, Then, Is There To Theorize About?" *American Archivist* 45 (Winter 1982): 19-25 and Gregg D. Kimball, "The Burke-Cappon Debate: Some Further Criticisms and Considerations for Archival Theory," *American Archivist* 48 (Fall 1985): 369-76.



to document society. The archival profession is more than just a service occupation or a subset of other disciplines, as some seem inclined to argue; it has a theoretical basis for practice and it needs to continue the development of that theoretical foundation.<sup>36</sup>

Most archivists would agree with Burke's assessment that archival theory building is severely restricted because of archivists' lack of time and opportunity to devote to research, the second challenge confronting the archival profession. Nor do archival educators have much time to inspire and encourage graduate students to do research. The first priority of the archival profession should be to place experienced and capable archivists in full-time academic positions, where they can challenge students to address neglected topics in archival literature, as well as have time for their own archival writing. This seems, at last, to be occurring. The University of British Columbia now has two internationally known and respected archival educators. A full-time teaching archivist has been hired in the library school at the University of Texas, and there are plans for employing a second. The library school at the State University of New York at Albany has recently hired one of the foremost experts on records management and is now moving to hire an archivist as well. Archival education appears to be on the threshold of new and exciting developments that have tremendous implications for the entire profession's continuing growth, especially its literature.

Besides the appointment of full-time archival educators, the American archival profession must obtain considerably

greater support for research and development. The recent SAA Goals and Priorities Task Force report identifies this as a priority activity, urging more opportunities for such work along with the "establishment of a national foundation to coordinate and promote archival research and development."<sup>37</sup> The Bentley fellowship program, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Andrew Mellon and other foundations, is a viable model already having generated a sizeable amount of research and writing.<sup>38</sup> But more such incentives are needed. If NHPRC's funding base could be increased, it could develop a program for individual research, such as that offered by the NEH, a program which, it seems, archivists have not used to advantage. Other possibilities that have long been ignored are the creation of research and development units in archival institutions, the development of sabbatical and release-time programs, and temporary exchanges of staff among archival programs facilitating additional research. Without increased professional support and emphasis, archival theory and literature will remain seriously limited, unable to profit from the obvious talents of individual archivists.

The absence of a strong national institutional leader is the fourth obstacle to a developing and vibrant American archival literature. The National Archives fulfilled that role for a very long time, and there are renewed hopes that with its recently won independence it will reassume this position. Former Archivist of the United States, Robert M. Warner, stated that its independence was essential for "assisting the American archival community. . . .

<sup>36</sup>It should be obvious that I strongly disagree with the views expressed by John W. Roberts, "Archival Theory: Much Ado About Shelving," *American Archivist* 50 (Winter 1987): 66-74.

<sup>37</sup>*Planning for the Archival Profession*, 33.

<sup>38</sup>Much of the early work of the Bentley fellows focused on appraisal; for example, see the Spring 1985 issue of the *American Archivist*. A number of other important essays completed by the fellows have appeared in subsequent issues of the *American Archivist*.



The National Archives is in the best possible position of any archival institution to provide this service because of its size, its variety of activities and records, as well as its ability to experiment while drawing on the widest pool of expertise."<sup>39</sup> Most archivists continue to hope. Even stronger leadership from the national professional associations is also essential. SAA should expand its publications program beyond basic texts and carefully evaluate the effectiveness of its present publications program, including the *American Archivist*. Stated simply, are SAA's publications meeting the needs of today's archivists? NAGARA has made some very interesting contributions in recent years, especially its analysis of government records preservation needs and issuance of guidelines in areas such as local government and governors' records,<sup>40</sup> but it cannot mount an ambitious program unless it builds its financial base or develops stronger cooperative ventures with other organizations such as the SAA.

A much more serious problem inhibiting the development of archival literature is the way in which archivists view themselves. David Gracy has written about how others see archivists, suggesting that some of the image problems are due to archivists' own perceptions of what an archivist should be.<sup>41</sup> Building on Gracy's writings, it is logical to wonder if too few archivists seem to think of themselves as archivists, compelling many not to think seriously about writing on archival subjects. In one of the few essays on archival

research and writing, David Mycue suggested that archivists do historical research; there also have been ideas about specializations in administrative history.<sup>42</sup> Although well intentioned, such efforts seem misdirected. There are too many gaps in the profession's theory and literature for archivists to squander their energies on interesting, but tangential areas. Although existing archival literature has been characterized as too "nuts-and-bolts,"<sup>43</sup> case studies and practical reports about special projects and initiatives are still needed in many areas. Max J. Evans found this lack of case studies "ironic" and problematic: "It is ironic that although we are a profession concerned primarily with documentation, we have not created a permanent body of documentation, or precedent, upon which we can base future decisions and which we can use to train future generations of archivists."<sup>44</sup> There is much excellent work being done in archival institutions that is not being effectively reported. This must change if the profession is to continue to be strengthened to meet its mission of documenting society.

The condition of archival education and training accounts for the sixth major barrier to a healthier archival literature. Although there is evidence of new growth and strength, the persistent challenge is to persuade graduate students to study archival issues and topics. Most professions derive significant new ideas or testing of ideas from the work of its novice practitioners, who bring fresh perspectives and

<sup>39</sup>"The National Archives at Fifty," *Midwestern Archivist* 10, no. 1 (1985): 30.

<sup>40</sup>Such as *Preservation Needs in State Archives* (Albany: National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators, February 1986).

<sup>41</sup>"What's Your Totem? Archival Images in the Public Mind," *Midwestern Archivist* 10, no. 1 (1985): 17-23 and "Our Future is Now," *American Archivist* 48 (Winter 1985): 12-21.

<sup>42</sup>David Mycue, "The Archivist as a Scholar: A Case for Research by Archivists," *Georgia Archive* 7 (Fall 1979): 10-16 and Arthur D. Larson, "Administrative History: A Proposal for a Reevaluation of Its Contributions to the Archival Profession," *Midwestern Archivist* 7, no. 1 (1982): 34-45.

<sup>43</sup>Peter J. Wosh, "Creating a SemiProfessional Profession: Archivists View Themselves," *Georgia Archive* 10 (Fall 1982): 6-7.

<sup>44</sup>"The Visible Hand: Creating a Practical Mechanism for Cooperative Appraisal," *Midwestern Archivist* 11, no. 1 (1986): 9.

insights. Yet serious research by students on archival topics is rare. There are hundreds of theses and dissertations on topics in history and library science for every one on an archival subject.<sup>45</sup> The American archival profession must have strong graduate training programs extending far beyond the traditional infatuation with practical, craft-like concerns to interest in theory and research. Thus far, only two graduate archival education programs—the University of Maryland and the University of British Columbia—have shown any proclivity for such research and writing; this is obviously too small a number to have much impact on archival literature and theory.<sup>46</sup> Nor is there a viable model to be emulated, and archival literature is the less for it.

Finally, archivists face the same challenges in publishing scholarly works as members of other related professions. Publishing a major monograph is difficult due to increasing production costs and severely limited sales.<sup>47</sup> A more fundamental problem, however, may be the tendency of many professionals to write only for each other, rather than addressing wider issues in readable ways that would interest a broader public. The care and management of our documentary

heritage is a vital public issue; archivists must present this case in a way that the public can comprehend and be persuaded to support. More subventionary grants must also be actively sought to ensure the completion and publication of scholarly archival works. Equally important, archivists must write both scholarly and popular works. If this occurs, archival theory will be strengthened, and the resources necessary for supporting work on such theory will improve.

What is the present condition of archival literature in the United States? This summary review reveals significant progress. These improvements in the archival literature correspond with overall improvements in the profession. But archivists face some serious challenges if such progress is to continue. Not all archivists need or want to write, but more should. Not all archival work must be described in publication, but more should. Not all archivists need to grapple with weighty theoretical issues, but more should. The condition of the literature indicates much about the condition of the archival profession. Strengthening the literature will make better archivists, both now and in the future.

---

<sup>45</sup>The actual impact of graduate archival education programs on archival research and writing is yet another topic deserving more attention. A crude measurement is an examination of one year of *Dissertations Abstracts International*. Volume 44 (1983/84) of that publication revealed a total of sixty-two dissertations on library science topics and one dissertation on an archival topic.

<sup>46</sup>There are positive signs. Some archival educators have directed their students to researching and writing about more substantive topics. Frank Burke has encouraged his students to analyze some of the concerns raised in his "Future Course" essay, some of which have been published; see Kimball, "Burke-Cappon Debate," and Wosh, "Creating a SemiProfessional Profession." Others seem intent to follow this example. The brochure on Western Washington University's archival program states that "thesis topics involving the history of archives administration and records management, or emerging problems in these disciplines, are encouraged."

<sup>47</sup>"The Crisis in Scholarly Publishing," *AHA Perspectives* 24 (March 1986): 7-8, 10.

# **Appendix I** **Quantity Ranking of Archival Literature by Subject, 1942-81**

|   | 1942/43 | 1945/46 | 1948/49 | 1951/52 | 1954/55 | 1957/58 | 1960/61 | 1963 | 1966 | 1969 | 1972 | 1975 | 1978 | 1981 | Mean Ranking |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| <b>Subject</b>  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |              |
| Arrangement and Description of Records and Manuscripts                                | 1       | 1       | 2       | 2       | 2       | 2       | 1       | 1    | 1    | 1    | 2    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1.4          |
| Repositories: History, Organization, and Activities                                   | 2       | 2       | 1       | 1       | 1       | 1       | 2       | 2    | 2    | 2    | 1    | 2    | 2    | 3    | 1.7          |
| Management of Current Records   | 4       | 4       | 3       | 3       | 3       | 3       | 4       | 3    | 3    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 3    | 4    | 3.5          |
| Use of Archives and Historical Manuscripts  | 10      | 8       | 4       | 4       | 4       | 5       | 6       | 5    | 6    | 5    | 5    | 3    | 6    | 6    | 3.5          |
| General Literature  | 8       | 8       | 6       | 6       | 6       | 4       | 3       | 4    | 4    | 4    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 2    | 4.8          |
| Preservation, Restoration, and Storage of Records and Historical Manuscripts          | 8       | 10      | 7       | 7       | 10      | 6       | 5       | 6    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 6    | 4    | 5    | 6.4          |
| Application of Photographic Processes to Work with Records and Historical Manuscripts | 6       | 6       | 5       | 5       | 7       | 7       | 7       | 7    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 5    | 7    | 10   | 6.9          |
| Appraisal and Disposition of Records and Historical Manuscripts                       | 4       | 5       | 8       | 9       | 9       | 8       | 8       | 9    | 9    | 9    | 8    | 8    | 9    | 8    | 7.9          |
| Training and Professional Development   | x       | 11      | 9       | 10      | 8       | 9       | 10      | 8    | 8    | 10   | 7    | 7    | 8    | 7    | 8            |

|  | 7 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 9 | x | x  | x | 8.1 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|----|---|-----|
| Special Physical Types of Records and Historical Manuscripts | 7 |   |   |   |   |    |   |    |   |   |    |   |     |
| Historical Editing and Documentary Publication               | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x | x  | x | 7 | 10 | 9 | 10  |

**Note:** Subjects that were not listed in a given year or that accounted for less than 1 percent of the literature have been indicated by an “x”.

**Source:** Annual bibliographies in the *American Archivist* 6 (October 1943): 273-88; 9 (October 1946): 347-67; 12 (October 1949): 381-412; 15 (October 1952): 337-66; 18 (October 1955): 348-76; 22 (January 1959): 217-26; 25 (January 1962): 83-107; 27 (October 1964): 31 (July 1968): 279-99; 34 (July 1971): 288-311; 37 (July 1974): 435-57; 40 (April 1977): 207-33; 43 (Summer 1980): 341-64; and Patricia A. Andrews and Bettye J. Grier, comps., *Writings on Archives, Historical Manuscripts, and Current Records: 1979-1982* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1985).

## Appendix II

### Percentage Ranking of Archival Literature by Subject, 1942-81

| Subject   | 1942/43 | 1945/46 | 1948/49 | 1951/52 | 1954/55 | 1957/58 | 1960/61 | 1963 | 1966 | 1969 | 1972 | 1975 | 1978 | 1981 | Overall Percentage |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------------|
| Arrangement and Description of Records and Manuscripts                                | 32.8    | 21.1    | 20.9    | 19.3    | 21.7    | 29.8    | 28.9    | 24.7 | 31.1 | 25.8 | 20.0 | 25.8 | 30.5 | 31.8 | 26.1               |
| Repositories: History, Organization, and Activities                                   | 27.7    | 17.0    | 38.8    | 34.2    | 29.2    | 22.8    | 28.1    | 22.4 | 23.9 | 23.4 | 34.5 | 19.5 | 16.6 | 16.3 | 24.8               |
| Management of Current Records   | 7.9     | 4.4     | 10.7    | 12.4    | 18.2    | 14.9    | 8.7     | 15.6 | 13.5 | 13.6 | 8.3  | 6.9  | 11.6 | 9.9  | 11.5               |
| Use of Archives and Historical Manuscripts  | x       | 4.4     | 9.2     | 8.5     | 10.0    | 6.1     | 5.0     | 8.3  | 5.7  | 8.0  | 7.5  | 13.7 | 7.9  | 5.4  | 7.6                |
| General Literature  | 1.2     | 4.4     | 5.1     | 4.0     | 4.4     | 7.0     | 12.7    | 10.0 | 8.7  | 12.1 | 12.0 | 8.3  | 10.8 | 19.3 | 9.0                |
| Preservation, Restoration, and Storage of Records and Historical Manuscripts          | 1.2     | 3.0     | 4.3     | 3.1     | 1.4     | 4.6     | 5.2     | 7.0  | 7.1  | 8.0  | 7.5  | 5.4  | 10.6 | 8.0  | 5.8                |
| Application of Photographic Processes to Work with Records and Historical Manuscripts | 5.0     | 8.1     | 5.6     | 5.4     | 3.7     | 4.4     | 4.2     | 3.8  | 4.1  | 2.6  | 1.8  | 6.9  | 4.0  | x    | 4.1                |
| Appraisal and Disposition of Records and Historical Manuscripts                       | 7.9     | 9.6     | 2.3     | 2.0     | 1.9     | 3.3     | 2.0     | 2.4  | 1.6  | 1.5  | 3.5  | 3.6  | 3.2  | 3.2  | 3.1                |
| Training and Professional Development   | x       | 1.9     | 1.5     | 1.8     | 2.3     | 2.0     | x       | 3.0  | 2.3  | 1.1  | 3.8  | 4.7  | 3.4  | 4.0  | 2.5                |

Special Physical

Types of Records and  
Historical Manuscripts

|   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1.7   | 4.8 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 6.1 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 1.6 | x   | x   | x   | x   | x   | 2.6 |
| Historical Editing and<br>Documentary Publication | x   | x   | x   | x   | x   | x   | x   | x   | 4.1 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 2.1 |

**Note:** Subjects that were not listed in a given year or that accounted for less than 1 percent of the literature have been indicated by an "x".

**Source:** Annual bibliographies in the *American Archivist* 6 (October 1943): 273-88; 9 (October 1946): 347-67; 12 (October 1949): 381-412; 15 (October 1952): 337-66; 18 (October 1955): 348-76; 22 (January 1959): 83-104, (April 1959): 217-26; 25 (January 1962): 83-107; 27 (October 1964): 531-61; 31 (July 1968): 279-99; 34 (July 1971): 288-311; 37 (July 1974): 435-57; 40 (April 1977): 207-33; 43 (Summer 1980): 341-64; and Patricia A. Andrews and Bettye J. Grier, comps., *Writings on Archives, Historical Manuscripts, and Current Records: 1979-1982* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1985).



Appendix III

Quantity Ranking of Archival Literature (on U.S. Subjects) by Publication Media, 1942-81

|  | 1942/43 | 1945/46 | 1948/49 | 1951/52 | 1954/55 | 1957/58 | 1960/61 | 1963 | 1966 | 1969 | 1972 | 1975 | 1978 | 1981 | Mean Ranking |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| <b>Media</b>   |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |              |
| Finding Aids   | 1       | 2       | 1       | 3       | 4       | 4       | 3       | 4    | 1    | 2    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 2.1          |
| Archival Journals  | 7       | 6       | 4       | 1       | 2       | 6       | 1       | 3    | 2    | 1    | 2    | 2    | 1    | 3    | 2.9          |
| Library Journals   | 6       | 5       | 6       | 3       | x       | 1       | 2       | 1    | 3    | 6    | 5    | 6    | 6    | 2    | 4.0          |
| Federal Publications   | 3       | 1       | 2       | 6       | 1       | 2       | 6       | 5    | 5    | 5    | 4    | 3    | 7    | 6    | 4.0          |
| Records Management Journals                                    | x       | x       | x       | x       | 6       | x       | x       | x    | 7    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 3    | 4    | 4.1          |
| Historical Journals  | 2       | 4       | 5       | 2       | 3       | 7       | 8       | 7    | 8    | 4    | 7    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5.1          |
| Office and Management Journals                                 | 5       | 2       | 3       | 3       | 4       | 3       | 3       | 2    | 4    | 9    | 9    | 7    | 8    | 12   | 5.3          |
| Miscellaneous  | 10      | 7       | 7       | 10      | 5       | 10      | 5       | 6    | 11   | 6    | 5    | 8    | 4    | 8    | 7.3          |
| Library, Information Science, and Records Management Textbooks | 8       | 10      | x       | 7       | x       | 9       | 9       | 8    | 6    | 9    | 8    | 9    | 9    | 11   | 7.4          |
| Annual Reports   | 4       | 8       | 8       | 9       | 8       | 8       | 7       | 9    | 10   | 9    | 11   | 10   | 10   | 8    | 8.5          |
| Institutional Publications                                     | 9       | 9       | x       | 8       | 7       | 4       | 9       | 11   | 9    | 8    | 10   | 11   | 11   | 7    | 8.7          |
| Archival Textbooks and Monographs                              | x       | 11      | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x    | 12   | 13   | 11   | 12   | 9    | 10   | 11.1         |
| Documentary Editions   | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | 10   | 12   | 12   | x    | x    | x    | x    | 11.3         |

**Note:** Media that accounted for less than 1 percent of the total have been indicated by an "x".

**Source:** Annual bibliographies in the *American Archivist* 6 (October 1943): 273-88; 9 (October 1946): 347-67; 12 (October 1949): 381-412; 15 (October 1952): 337-66; 18 (October 1955): 348-76; 22 (January 1959): 83-104, (April 1959): 217-26; 25 (January 1962): 83-107; 27 (October 1964): 531-61; 31 (July 1968): 279-99; 34 (July 1971): 288-311; 37 (July 1974): 435-57; 40 (April 1977): 207-33; 43 (Summer 1980): 341-64; and Patricia A. Andrews and Bettye J. Grier, comps., *Writings on Archives, Historical Manuscripts, and Current Records: 1979-1982* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1985).

Appendix IV

Percentage Ranking of Archival Literature (on U.S. Subjects) by Publication Media, 1942-81

|  | 1942/43 | 1945/46 | 1948/49 | 1951/52 | 1954/55 | 1957/58 | 1960/61 | 1963 | 1966 | 1969 | 1972 | 1975 | 1978 | 1981 | Overall Percentage |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------------|
| <b>Media</b>   |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                    |
| Finding Aids   | 18.8    | 13.1    | 19.1    | 14.2    | 11.7    | 13.3    | 14.3    | 14.8 | 27.2 | 15.3 | 20.5 | 21.5 | 18.8 | 20.7 | 17.5               |
| Archival Journals  | 6.9     | 10.8    | 16.5    | 17.8    | 18.7    | 9.1     | 16.3    | 15.4 | 13.3 | 20.8 | 17.4 | 12.0 | 18.8 | 19.4 | 15.1               |
| Library Journals   | 8.9     | 11.7    | 10.6    | 14.2    | x       | 17.5    | 14.3    | 22.4 | 11.5 | 6.6  | 7.9  | 10.3 | 9.7  | 19.7 | 12.1               |
| Federal Publications   | 11.4    | 20.3    | 18.6    | 9.5     | 20.6    | 15.7    | 10.7    | 12.7 | 9.7  | 6.9  | 8.4  | 11.2 | 6.0  | 4.9  | 11.6               |
| Records Management Journals                                    | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x    | 5.0  | 13.9 | 14.2 | 11.2 | 11.7 | 14.1 | 5.4                |
| Historical Journals  | 18.3    | 12.6    | 12.3    | 14.6    | 14.0    | 5.9     | 4.6     | 3.9  | 4.3  | 7.7  | 6.3  | 10.9 | 10.8 | 6.9  | 9.3                |
| Office and Management Journals                                 | 9.9     | 13.1    | 16.9    | 14.2    | 11.7    | 15.4    | 12.8    | 15.8 | 10.4 | 4.4  | 4.2  | 6.6  | 5.1  | x    | 9.6                |
| Miscellaneous  | 4.9     | 8.1     | 7.6     | 2.8     | 8.6     | 1.4     | 12.8    | 4.8  | 2.2  | 5.8  | 7.9  | 6.9  | 6.0  | 3.3  | 5.7                |
| Library, Information Science, and Records Management Textbooks | 5.9     | x       | x       | 5.1     | 6.2     | 4.2     | 4.1     | 2.1  | 7.5  | 4.4  | 5.8  | 4.0  | 2.8  | x    | 3.2                |
| Annual Reports   | 10.4    | 4.9     | 6.8     | 3.6     | 3.9     | 4.2     | 6.1     | 3.3  | 2.9  | 4.4  | 2.1  | 3.2  | 1.7  | 3.3  | 4.1                |
| Institutional Publications                                     | 4.5     | 3.2     | x       | 3.9     | 4.7     | 13.3    | 4.1     | 1.8  | 3.9  | 4.7  | 3.2  | 1.1  | x    | 4.3  | 3.7                |
| Archival Textbooks and Monographs                              | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x    | 1.1  | 1.1  | 2.1  | x    | 2.8  | 2.0  | x                  |
| Documentary Editions   | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | x       | 3.0  | 1.1  | 4.0  | x    | x    | x    | x    | x                  |

**Note:** Media that accounted for less than 1 percent of the total have been indicated by an "x".

**Source:** Annual bibliographies in the *American Archivist* 6 (October 1943): 273-88, 9 (October 1946): 347-67, 12 (October 1949): 381-412, 15 (October 1952): 337-66, 18 (October 1955): 348-76, 22 (January 1959): 83-104, (April 1959): 217-26, 25 (January 1962): 83-107, 27 (October 1964): 531-61, 31 (July 1968): 279-99, 34 (July 1971): 288-311, 37 (July 1974): 435-57, 40 (April 1977): 207-33, 43 (Summer 1980): 341-64, and Patricia A. Andrews and Bettye J. Grier, comps., *Writings on Archives, Historical Manuscripts, and Current Records: 1979-1982* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1985).